

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-24 were pending and under consideration. In a previous Amendment, Claims 7-18 were cancelled without prejudice against their reintroduction into this or one or more timely-filed related applications. Claims 25-31 have been added. Thus, after entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-6 and 19-31 are pending and under consideration.

All of the amendments and claims are supported throughout the specification and claims as originally filed. Accordingly, the amendments do not present new matter and entry is proper.

Claims 25-31 depend from Claim 1, and correspond to originally filed claims 11-14 and 16-18 respectively. When any claim is allowed, all dependent claims are allowable without further examination for novelty or obviousness, other than to make sure the dependent claims satisfy 35 USC § 112. In *Ex Parte* Ligh 159 USPQ 61, 62 (Bd. App. 1967), the Board of Appeals held it was error to reject a dependent claim while allowing its parent.

Election

The claims were restricted to two inventions. In a previous Amendment, Applicant elected invention I (Claims 1-6 and 19-24) without traverse.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that Claims 1-6 and 19-31 satisfy all of the statutory requirements for patentability and are in condition for allowance. An early notification of the same is kindly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FOOTHILL LAW GROUP, LLP

/John F. Brady/

By: John F. Brady

Reg. No. 39,118

Date: August 3, 2005

FOOTHILL LAW GROUP, LLP

3333 Bowers Ave., Suite 130

Santa Clara, CA 95054

Phone: 408-293-0880